

Committee on Performance-Based Compensation for Teachers

September 22, 2004

9:00am – 3:00pm

LBJ Building, Room 302

650 West State Street

Boise, ID

Minutes as amended and approved October 12, 2004

Teresa Molitor presented a Position statement paper from IACI.

Dr. Don Coberly from the Boise School District talked to the committee about End-of-Course Assessments

The assessment is a combination of performance/writing and objective. The data is helpful to individual teachers as well as the departments and the district. The EOC is just part of the student grade. He noted that there have been teacher comments that the kids who don't do well in class also don't do well on the EOC.

The software costs approximately \$100,000. Additional costs that need to be considered are test development time and teaching staff.

A question that was raised is how a program like this could be leveraged to include small districts. Perhaps small districts could join larger nearby districts. Ultimately, it could really work if there was a statewide common curriculum.

Idaho Falls and Jerome are also doing some end-of-course assessment work

Don said that the EOC score is sent to parents.

He also pointed out that the EOC helps teachers teach the curriculum

Jack asked about the relationship of the test based on socio-economic conditions. He said he wanted to be assured that data collection could be aggregated to reflect socio-economic information so teachers aren't penalized because of socio-economic influences.

Pay for Performance Systems for Teachers

Dr. Gene Davis and Dr. Charles Zimmerly, from the ISU Center for Policy Studies, Education Research, and Community Development, presented a policy brief on teacher compensation they had just completed. They gave a power point presentation on the brief "Pay for Performance Systems for Teachers", which is a quick reference on the work that is being done around the country on performance-based compensation for teachers.

The key is how to identify the outstanding teacher and link it to the student achievement. We need to identify the process model that recognizes the teachers who are effective. Teacher performance drives student achievement.

Park Price, President Bank of Idaho, talked to the committee about the work being done by the Idaho Business Coalition for Excellence in Education. Park heads a subcommittee on teacher quality, assessment and professional development. The idea of the coalition is to share business-plans that work in the their businesses.

The quality of an education organization is determined by how well students perform. Business leaders have a valid interest in the education outcomes of our students. Businesses are the consumers of the product put out by our schools. At some point in time the businesses are the ones that hire the students.

A company is best developed by first developing an assessment system - assessment of employee skills and how well the goals are reached. The goals must be identified by the company head. In the case of education it would be the principal and the superintendent.

Cliff asked if the following is how we might see it in education: At the state level a framework is set – ‘this is what we want to see’. At the local level it is determined how the goals will be met. There is buy in on how the goals are to be accomplished at the local level. Park said that every level has to sign off to meet their part.

You look to examples of systems that work reflecting what is important to the organization.

The assessment is used as coaching and to recognize s/he is doing a good job.

It is important to avoid the “star” system. Also, teacher accountability is important but it is just as important to hold the principal and superintendent accountable.

The principal needs to sit with staff and determine the goals. A system for performance pay must promote collegiality, making sure achievement is systemic.

All those that have something to do with resource allocation should be held accountable.

Park noted that if the assessment system is right, the pay part is fairly easy. The assessment system must have buy-in from those being assessed and the goals are agreed upon.

Stan asked about the difference of a banking industry where there are profits then the employees get bonuses. In the education system there are no monetary profits. Park responded that in a state system the resources must be there to compensate if the goals are met.

Jack asked if the grid system existed in private business. Park responded that there are no grids.

Variable Piece

With the variable piece compensation can be gained or lost within a year. Example would be Park's idea of a bonus. This needs to have a strong emphasis on outputs.

Reed gave the following scenario:

Each teacher has a personal performance pool.

Each teacher has certain criteria to get it.

Three areas

- 1- expected growth objective, individual
- 2- expected growth objective, school
- 3- Principal - needs to have management tools – specific, measurable, achievable, result oriented, and time specific

Reed passed out an example of a teacher review.

Byron and Colleen noted that what we've talked about are in most teacher evaluations presently.

John asked how much time do administrators spend in the classroom evaluating teachers.

Byron responded that it varies significantly. There is a lot of coaching that is done. The process is ongoing and more interactive. There is a formative evaluation and a summative.

The most important tool is multiple measures.

Goal setting for the school, grade and teacher

Ability to respond to changes in demographics and assessment from the state.

Reed said we shouldn't try to patent the process but to make available a process that gives administrators the tools to make the process effective.

Wendy talked about parent surveys. – Expanding Horizons Objective. In Utah there are community councils that are made up of educators and parents (the parents outnumber the educators) who advise the local school board. She suggested that perhaps we could pilot the community council program concept.

Reed noted that we all agree that the parental factor is important to the success of the students. What are other tools, other than the survey, that we can look at parent participation? What can a teacher do to increase parent involvement? Maybe the concept of the survey can be used in the principal evaluation piece.

Colleen said that maybe in terms of goal setting what are the 3 things you are going to do to increase parental participation?

John said he would like to see this as a group piece with measurement at the building level. Patty said she thought it should be something done at the local level, not state.

Karen said that we need to remember to keep parental involvement as a key to the assessment. Reed agreed that the parent involvement piece could be part of the

principal's evaluation. When it comes to parent involvement, we can't legislate but we can encourage.

In Closing

Parent survey or teacher outreach to parents should be part of principal's evaluation

Reed mentioned that the money needed to pilot a program has not been forgotten. He has been working with Legislative Services on this.

Stan mentioned that with whatever program the Board comes up there must be the resources to support it if every teacher improves.

Patty presented her input regarding the variable piece. She stressed that she thinks there should be multiple measures for student growth. There should also be a component for service and leadership.

Wendy reminded everyone that the conversation has to start with student achievement.

Stan presented the Denver model. He said it doesn't fit Idaho completely but it does have components to look at.

For next meeting be prepared to talk about factors that would influence amount of base pay.

Next meeting date is October 12, 2004